



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/805,945

03/22/2004

Kyle G. Brown

RSW920040006US1

1046

51016

7590

04/09/2008

IBM CORP. (RALEIGH SOFTWARE GROUP)

c/o Rudolf O Siegesmund Gordon & Rees, LLP

2100 Ross Avenue

Suite 2800

DALLAS, TX 75201

EXAMINER

WILLIAMS, CLAYTON R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2157

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/09/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/805,945	Applicant(s) BROWN ET AL.	
	Examiner Clayton R. Williams	Art Unit 2157	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Clayton R. Williams.

(3) Rudolf Seigesmund.

(2) Yves Dalencourt.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 07 April 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: ____.

Identification of prior art discussed: Wang, US 2003/0227894; Montero, US 2003/0120720.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Atty. Siegesmund argues that neither Wang or Montero, singly or in combination, teach the limitation of proposed claim 17. Examiner suggested atty formally submit amended claims and that further searching will be undertaken. Furthermore, examiner suggested to atty that it would be beneficial to further define the definition of "arbitrary" as used in the original claims.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Yves Dalencourt/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2157

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required